

From: (b) (6)
To: [Miller, Garyg](mailto:Miller.Garyg)
Subject: RE: San Jacinto River Waste Pits Site
Date: Friday, May 02, 2014 9:16:20 AM

Whewh...at least if you don't know the answer there isn't something terribly obvious I'm missing.
 Thanks for forwarding on to USACE.

If you are talking to them, anyway, I guess I would also point out that there is some talk about building a gate structure across the Houston Ship Channel (the "Centennial Gate"). The purpose would be to protect the ship channel from storm surge, which is frankly probably a better idea than the Ike Dike. But, if that structure was built and used in a storm, all the water not going up the ship channel would still have to go somewhere, again having implications for any structures built in the San Jacinto River and surrounding areas. In any event, I'll make sure to bring all of this up in our response, but I just wasn't sure if those considerations were part of the modeling.

Thanks again,

(b) (6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Miller, Garyg [<mailto:Miller.Garyg@epa.gov>]
 Sent: Friday, May 02, 2014 9:07 AM
 To: (b) (6)
 Subject: RE: San Jacinto River Waste Pits Site

Unknown?? Good question - I'll forward it to the USACE folks.

Gary Miller
 EPA Remedial Project Manager
 214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6) [[\(b\) \(6\)](mailto:(b) (6))]
 Sent: Friday, May 02, 2014 9:04 AM
 To: Miller, Garyg
 Cc: (b) (6)
 Subject: RE: San Jacinto River Waste Pits Site

Excellent, thanks.

Also, one quick question,...I know that they said the design was currently for a 100-year storm event with enhancements to be protective for 500 year storm events, but did the modeling really take into account the 25' storm surge that is predicted in the San Jacinto River in the event of a 100-year hurricane? What I've seen thus far looks like an evaluation of stream flow and flooding that would be appropriate in other parts of the country, but no modeling for storm surge related effects, but I am not an engineer, so I might be missing it.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

-----Original Message-----

From: Miller, Garyg [<mailto:Miller.Garyg@epa.gov>]



9546683

Sent: Friday, May 02, 2014 8:57 AM

To: (b) (6)
Cc: (b) (6); Walters, Donn; Sanchez, Carlos
Subject: RE: San Jacinto River Waste Pits Site

(b) (6)

Yes, that is a good approach.

Thanks,

Gary Miller
EPA Remedial Project Manager
214-665-8318
miller.garyg@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: (b) (6) [mailto:(b) (6)]
Sent: Wednesday, April 30, 2014 1:02 PM
To: Miller, Garyg
Cc: (b) (6)
Subject: Re: San Jacinto River Waste Pits Site

Gary,

Thanks again for this, I am currently working on a response. Quick question - I know that in the past you have provided me some documents as a courtesy, and I just want to make sure that it is acceptable that we reference the white paper along with the FS in our response. Given the short turnaround, it will be most efficient to express our reasons for respectfully disagreeing with the conclusions of the white paper and discussing the rational behind the community's preferred outcome, rather than providing a point by point response to all the possible alternatives presented in the FS.

Thanks,

(b) (6)

> On Apr 29, 2014, at 12:14 PM, "Miller, Garyg" <Miller.Garyg@epa.gov> wrote:
>
> (b) (6),
>
> Here is the FS and several other things - the PRPs White Paper on their recommended remedy, the NTSB report on the 1994 San Jacinto River flood.
>
> Gary Miller
> EPA Remedial Project Manager
> 214-665-8318
> miller.garyg@epa.gov
>
> <Draft Final Interim Feasibility Study Report 03-21-2014.pdf> <San
> Jacinto White Paper 03262014 Rev1.pdf> <NTSB San Jac Pipeline
> Investigation - 1994 Flood - 1996.pdf>